

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-19 and 21 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objections and rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 18 and 19 are allowed and that claims 2-7 and 11-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Further, the Examiner has indicated that claims 16 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph; claim 17 including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

By the Office Action, the declaration has been deemed defective for failing to indicate a priority claim to a previously filed provisional application. Respectfully, the declaration is believed to be sufficient; a declaration need not include priority information as it relates to U.S. provisional applications, only foreign priority information must be indicated. Therefore, the declaration is believed to be sufficient.

The drawings have been objected to; descriptive text labels have been required for Figs. 1-16. Replacement drawings are attached hereto including descriptive text labels in corresponding legends in which reference numbers 6** are path tables, 7** are tunnels, 8** are switches and 9** are paths. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

The specification has been objected to, wherein the serial no. and status of the U.S. patent application referenced on page 1 is needed. By amendment to the specification, the patent no.

associated with the given title and filing date has been entered. The Examiner's reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 6, 9, 14, 16-18 and 20 have been objected to for various informalities.

With respect to claim 4, "the aggregation" has been amended to --an association--.

Further, the word "the" on line 6 is believed to be correct; "an aggregation" appears on line 4 of claim 4. Referring to claim 6, line 4, "the" has been amended to --an--. In claim 9, at line 3, "path connections" have been amended to --paths--. In claim 14, at line 2, the word "that" is believed to be correct; the claim may be read as "upon determining that" X, Y and Z, "have path table space to accommodate..." Further, for the same reasons as stated for line 2, the word "signal" on line 3 is believed to be correct. At line 4, "by a tunnel released" has been amended to --to release the tunnel--.

Regarding claim 16, line 6, "the virtual" has been amended to --virtual--; at line 13, "the" has been amended to --a--. In claim 17, at line 4, "the event" has been amended to --an event--.

Referring to claim 18, the semicolon on line 4 has been replaced by a colon; on line 6 "the virtual" has been amended to --virtual--. On line 9, "the tunnel" is believed to be correct; "a tunnel" appears on line 2.

Claim 20 has been cancelled.

The Examiner's reconsideration of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claim 16-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 16 has been amended, wherein “the first list” and “the second list” have been amended to read --a first list-- and --a second list-- respectively. Accordingly, claim 16 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 17 depends from claim 16. Claim 17 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 16. The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 10 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,353,593). The Examiner stated essentially that Chen teaches all the limitations of claims 1, 10 and 20.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable limitations of claim 2.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1. Claim 10 is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1. Claim 20 has been cancelled. The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.


Claims 8 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen. The Examiner stated, essentially, that Chen teaches or suggests all the limitations of claims 8 and 9.

Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 1. Claims 8 and 9 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1. The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New claim 21 includes the limitations of claim 1 and the limitations of allowable claim 4. Therefore, claim 21 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1, 3-19 and 21, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC

130 Woodbury Road

Woodbury, New York 11797

TEL: (516) 692-8888

FAX: (516) 692-8889